INTRODUCTION

Globalization is patently changing our understanding of politics, therefore bringing about a different approach to the definition of new social problems and the search for political solutions to them. One of the most interesting questions that debate on globalization has posed is how the traditional role of the Nation-State, as a decisive factor unifying political community and shaping citizenship, is currently being eroded. Hence an idea of global politics is emerging. But it poses in turn the question about the place from which we do act and the place where the new legitimacy is settled upon. In contemporary political theory, all this has given birth to a new cosmopolitanism, that defends the need for a new conception of democracy and citizenship.

Be that as it may, what has to be pointed out here is how this turn of politics towards the global scope affects environmental problems. For they are amongst the most relevant issues in global governance, mainly for two reasons. On the one hand, environmental problems and their effects (for instance, climate change) are global, and hence solutions beyond the national scope are required. On the other hand, globalization may benefit local-global relationship and contribute to the realization of a sustainable society. This obviously influence green political theory. For it tries to understand the transformation of political community in connection to the global scope of environmental problems, and therefore is committed since recently in a theoretical effort to lay the foundations of an idea of citizenship of his own, i.e. ecological citizenship.

From this standpoint, the goal of this paper is to explore the connections between the reflections on citizenship by a cosmopolitan approach, on the one hand, and the green political theory attempts to set an idea of citizenship by their own, on the other.

---

1 This paper is part of a broader line of research which I started in Keele University during 2000-2001 academic year, thanks to an allowance obtained from the Subprogramme of Spanish Researchers Stay in Spanish and Foreign Research Centres (PR2000-0361). I would like to thank Andrew Dobson both his continuous support and the interesting observations made to my ideas about this topic since then.
However, my position is that although the idea of an ecological citizenship may be judged as a kind of cosmopolitan or global citizenship, its features and current degree of development goes further, hence demanding its inclusion into a contemporary citizenship theory among the new varieties of citizenship.

THE TURN TOWARD GLOBAL POLITICS AND ENVIRONMENT

One of the most important effects of globalization is the loss of centrality of the Nation-state as the core of the political community facing a growing increase of the international political dimension. Hence, a new conception of global politics which demands at the same time global solutions and poses new problems seem to emerge. Particularly from where we act and establish the new legitimacy. This has favoured within the political theory of the last years, the appearance of a new cosmopolitanism which attempts to assume the different identities within a concept of cosmopolitan democracy, which involves a theoretical and institutional reformulation toward this new reality.

Our subject matter here is the close relationship between this political shift toward global and ecological issues. In this sense, environmental problems are a component of what we call here global politics and its reflection over citizenship forms an axis which provides the backbone of a political community, which no longer responds to the concepts of liberal citizenship or social citizenship. In this context, some of the aspects of the approach of new cosmopolitanism, concretely, those related to the formulation of citizenship, connect to the attempt of the formulation of green politics theory of a notion of ecological citizenship. Undoubtedly, one of the reasons of this theoretical evolution relies in the shift of ecological problems in one of the main topics of what is known as global governance. Thus, for example, the climatic change or the destruction of the ozone layer, would be part of those problems derived from the appearance of new global public goods; id est (that is to say), those that can not be satisfied individually and demand a cooperation among them in search for solutions. To this we would have to add, the global dimension of the risks generated by the ecological problems themselves, threats that arise with the non existence of an enemy and alter the relationship of causality. This double side of the environmental as a public good to defend and as a potential threat beyond the Nation-state, make necessary new theoretical spaces to justify the legitimacy of both the conservation of the nature and the prevention in view of the consequences of ecological catastrophes. Thereby, and
from my point of view, the concept of ecological citizenship constitutes one of those new theoretical spaces.

The aim of this paper is to analyze the incidence of globalization in the environmental problem and in the formulation of a new concept of citizenship. In this way, the situation of the ecological issues as one of the topics concerning the global governance is an essential issue to understand both its relationship with some assumptions of the new cosmopolitanism and with its citizenship theory. This allow us to understand ecological citizenship as a kind of global citizenship or, even a sort of post-cosmopolitan citizenship. My thesis is that ecological citizenship is still a work in progress, but has its own architecture which breaks up with the traditional conceptions of citizenship and locates it within these new parameters. On that account, I will focus on three aspects: first of all, in the relationship between globalization, environmental problems and new cosmopolitanism; in the second place, the reason why I think that the ecological citizenship is part of the concept of global citizenship and participates from a notion of collective responsibility; and finally, why I think that the ecological citizenship is a post-cosmopolitan citizenship not only because it has its own architecture as opposed to the traditional dimensions of the citizenship, but also because of its relationship with a green democratic model, clearly deliberative.

GLOBALIZATION, ENVIRONMENT AND COSMOPOLITISM

The globalization of the environmental problems and the environmental degradation raise two essential issues: on the one hand, the boundaries of the liberal democracy for its resolution (Goldblatt, 1997); and, on the other, the appearance of a conscience and societies cosmopolitan. This triggers, at least two problems: on the one hand, if environmental problems are global, liberal democracy, which in any case, proves to be efficient in the Nation-state field, turns out to be inefficient in search for proper political solutions; and, on the other, that the definition and political project of a cosmopolitan society is furthermore not enough due to a lack of efficiency of international politic institutions. From that view, the disagreements are located within three levels:

1. In the first place, those that adopt a constructive position about the governability of the globalization but maintain different theoretical positions concerning the definition criteria and the political project of a cosmopolitan society.
2. In the second place, those that maintain a pessimistic position defending that globalization is not governable and that, the control of natural resources will even be one of the sources of future international conflicts.

3. Finally, those that from a realistic position maintain that the situation of the current international order hinders a global political management of environmental problems.

1. In the first case, the goal of the discussion is the capacity and the options offered by politics toward a global change that reconfigures the role of the Nation-state, our idea of political community and the role of international relationships in the solution of global politic problems, such as the environmental one. Globalization involves, then, a transition from a State-centered politic to a new and complex multilevel global politic in which the answers of both supporters and critics of neoliberalism as well as antiglobalization ones are insufficient. In this context, cosmopolitan social democracy (Held and McGrew, 2002) aims at two things: on the one hand, be an intermediate position in search for overlapping points among supporters and critics of globalization; and, on the other, be a framework of thought and political action about these issues which besides suggests that progressive thought should gather. There is no doubt that David Held’s position is the most constructive one as he tries to define debate topics and bring forward a framework of institutional and political reform, although it is true that little is said about the environmental problem.

In this line, as regards the proposal of a theoretical framework to shed light to this reconfiguration of politics determined by globalization is also Ulrich Beck. However, we can find in him, both a different version of the role of the political action in the management of global problems as an absence of institutional alternatives of reform concerning global governance. The thesis of the German sociologist is that more than a cosmopolitan society is preferable to talk about a world risk society (Beck, 1999). At this point, and against those approaches –like Held’s- in which supranational social spaces arise as a consequence of the international activity and the identification of determined actors and institutions, we have to recognize as well the non desired dangers of developed industrial societies changing into conflictive the international political sand, irrespective of whether their searched effects are publicly discussed. This way, Beck distinguishes among three kinds of global danger (Beck, 1998: 67-69) that imply different type of ecological damages:
1. **Ecological dangers conditioned by richness** and technique industrial dangers. Here we would include the hole of the ozone layer and greenhouse effect but also the unpredictable and incalculable consequences of the genetic manipulation and transplant techniques.

2. **Ecological dangers conditioned by poverty** and technique-industrial dangers. There is a close relationship between poverty and environmental damages. Thus, inequality is one of the essential factors of ecological damages. In this way, if ecological damages conditioned by richness are conditioned by the exteriorization of the production costs of wealthy countries and are equally distributed through the planet, ecological damages conditioned by poverty take place in a poor country but they are internationalized in the medium term as secondary effects in wealthy countries. The most well-known examples would be, the deforestation of the tropical forest, toxic residuous, the great obsolete technologies (chemical and atomic industries) and in the future, genetic industries. Those elements arise as a consequence of started and interrupted modernization processes that threat the environment and life, the countries not having institutional and appropriated political means to avoid possible resulting damages.

3. **Dangers of massive destruction weapons (nuclear, chemical or biological).** In this case, apart from dangers of regional or global self-destruction in war situation as a consequence of militar-statal confrontation a fundamentalist or private terrorism would have to be added.

   The society diagnosis of the world risk society (Beck, 1998:70) is double: on the one hand, global dangers put an end to the traditional security system – the damages become global and permanent, it is difficult to delimit its responsibility and planification, mixing besides with other political conflicts; and, on the other an unintentional politization of all the risk conflicts is produced.

   In a word, the only way out that we have in the presence of risk conflicts is that its technocratic management open new spaces of political action and, consequently, for environmental conflicts. Nevertheless, from my point of view, the main problem of this approach is that it lacks a rigorous posing over social individuals and the institutional development of politization provoked by these new conflicts. In this way, political space becomes diffuse within world risk society. In short, Beck’s model works better when identifying the big problems of politics and global changes, but turns to be much weaker when modelling the construction of political alternatives and of proposing the institutional reform formulae to make them possible. In this sense, and although he
leaves the door open to politics in search for solutions toward globalization problems and, consequently, he shares with Held the idea that this is governable, the lack of an institutional perspective locates him in a weak constructive position.

2. The opposite side of the former theories is that represented by those authors who think that globalization is ungovernable and, therefore, more a source of conflicts than a cosmopolitan society. That is John Gray’s position in the so called the real limits of globalization (Gray, 2003). From this perspective, globalization “is leading us back to a series of old and difficult conflicts difficult to be overcome, above all, conflicts on the control of natural resources. Subsequent wars will be more and more malthusian. The fight not for ideologies but for the land, the water and the crude oil- frequently in connection with religious and ethnic enmities-will trigger the wars of twenty first century. The limits of the development will come back in the shape of new scarcity wars” (the translation is mine) (Gray, 2003:355-356). The centrality of crude oil in the economies of developed countries and its character of finite energy source makes the world come back to a classical geopolitics of the nineteenth century, where dependence and shortage of natural resources such as crude oil, and water, will be the source of international conflicts.

The growing shortage of resources provokes, among other effects (Gray, 2003:357), an increase in number of ecological and environmental refugees and, as an answer to that, a revival of the ultra-left wing parties in wealthy countries. The natural reaction toward the destruction of environment in poor countries explains immigration and the defensive reaction of western democracies before this fact. Furthermore, the origin of wars will additionally be for the control of resources, in particular, crude oil, becoming the zone of the Gulf in a specially problematic area due to the combination of three factors: the decrease of human resources, the rapid growing of the population and the existence of firmly rooted religious conflicts.

In a nutshell, one of the most interesting elements in Gray’s position is that globalization is ungovernable, among other things, because it is conditioned by environmental limits- overpopulation or control of natural resources like crude oil or water- which lead to an intensification of unsteadiness and conflict and not, of course, to a cosmopolitan society.

3. Additionally, there are other critical perspectives on globalization (Falk, 2002) that point out the paradox in which the relationship between politics and environment is submitted. In other words, the environmental problem is one of the decisive topics of
the global political agenda but it does exist a clear political incompetence to manage it globally. It is true that the environmental conscience has increased all over the world and that exist a global consensus as regards environment but there will only be progress in the resolution of the problems if the States cooperate to achieve the sustainable development and in the meantime the ecological damage is still being very serious.

The thesis is simple: the current world order is below present circumstances raised by the environmental problem. The main problem is the absence of political willingness, both on the part of the State and of the market. The factors are different: in the first place, the absence of responsibility of political leaders toward adverse effects on environment that may be produced in the future; in the second place, that the electoral terms do not coincide with with the time periods of answer facing the environmental challenge; in the third place, that the necessary changes in the citizenship political culture as regard ecological issues collide with the ruling consumerism and the submission to market forces of advanced capitalistic societies and, finally, a centrality within social concerns of immediate economical issues over environmental ones. Simultaneously, this has generated a new way of domination, which implies a shift from North to South of the highly polluting wastes, as a consequence of the location in the South of the industries that provoke it and that the North no longer wants. A shift seen by some critics of globalization, on the one hand, as a new way of domination generated by capitalism in its current phase (Amin, 1997) and on the other, as less and less possible way out and that proves the incompetence of the current capitalistic system to face the ecological (Wallerstein, 2001).

In this context, the main obstacle the international order faces when undertaking ecological issues is not its acknowledgement as one of the main problems the world confronts at a global scale, but the absence of political willingness to cope with them due to that “the States show a reticent attitude toward making easier the coordination establishing mechanisms of effective global governement in relation to the environmental agenda” (the translation is mine) (Falk, 2002:28). The paradox is clear, “the urgency and complexity of the environmental challenge needs a supranational mechanism that has the benefit of political and financial independence, but only the States would be able to bring the resources and necessary commands. Their reluctance to go beyond the traditional ways of diplomacy suggest that the mental realistic attitude persists and the implicit limits on the governor effectivity –consensus dependence, voluntary character and absence of compulsory imposition-. The environmental challenge reveals, then, the
persistence of statism, including their adaptative impulses, but besides the big distance there is between current problems and the established solutions” (Falk, 2002: 41).

In this context, the diverse positions analyzed show that questions are not only identifying environmental problems and recognize that national answers are more and more limited. The real problem is to find theoretical principles and political formulae that regulates globally ecological issues. Globalization configurates a relationship between politics and environment in a different way than in the past. On the one hand, the perception of the vulnerability of the natural world increases and, on the other, states the governability of environmental problems. In this latter point two conclusions arise: in the first place the governability or not of globalization determines a major or minor role of the political action toward a kind of cosmopolitan solutions; and, in the second place, the paradox of environmental politics relies in the agreement to find solutions at a supranational level that depend of a political willingness non existent on the part of the States for their political articulation. In this context Democracy’s Dilemma (Paehlke, 2003) is to achieve a balance among globalization and the ecological imperatives of our time. In my opinion, the reflection around citizenship constitutes a reference to reorientate globalization toward the aims of a sustainable society.

GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP AND COLLECTIVE RESPONSIBILITY: KEYS TO UNDERSTAND THE CONCEPT OF ECOLOGICAL CITIZENSHIP

In last years we are witnesses of an irresistible rise of citizenship in contemporary politics theory and practice, due to the change the role of the Nation-state is suffering in western societies, as a consequence of processes of social change that strength the international dimension of politics. Therefore, the future democracy is affected by a political internationalization that argues about the Nation-state as a priviledged political subject and will demand profound changes not only in the power structure but also in the institutions of our democratic systems. Finally, the essential is the confirmation of the political community transformation. As David Held has stated, “the idea of a political community of fate –of a self-determining collectivity- can no longer meaningfully be located within the boundaries of a single nation-state. We are compelled to recognize that the extensity, intensity and impact of economic, political and environmental processes raise questions about where they are most appropriatly addressed” (Held, 2001: 399). Consequently, if the powerful effects of globalization,
both at an economical and geostrategic level, are changing our traditional vision of politics and democracy it seems obvious that this demands a reconsideration both on the vality of our institutions and their performance.

The need to think about institutional change and democratic control of these processes of social change has led some authors to share the idea of defining a *cosmopolitan project* (Held, 1995; Archibugi et alii, 1998; Linklater, 1998 b; Held and McGrew, 2002) who includes his own vision of democracy (Held, 1995) and citizenship (Held, 2001; Linklater, 1998 a; Linklater, 1998b; Linklater, 1998c). In this context, the concept of citizenship plays here a key role as implies “the enjoyment of civil, political, social and cultural rights, and corresponding duties to remove barriers to equal membership of the political community. A society which is committed to realising the ideals of citizenship is obliged by this conviction to engage outsiders in open dialogue about the respects in which its actions may harm their interests. It has an obligation to transcend the dichotomy between citizens and aliens by establishing systems of joint rule” (Linklater, 1998 b: 211-212). Therefore, one of the most interesting elements of the *cosmopolitan approach* concerning citizenship is its role of mediator concept in the dialogue of a political community made up for different cultural traditions and political discourses in the establishment of that framework of solidarity game which aims at overcoming the dichotomy between citizeships and aliens. This is also the line of argumentation of David Held he suggests that one of the political challenges of the future will be that “each citizen of a state will have to learn to become a “cosmopolitan citizen” as well: that is, a person capable of mediating between national traditions, communities of fate and alternative styles of life. Citizenship in a democratic polity of the future is likely to involve a growing mediating role: a role which encompasses dialogue with traditions and discourses of others with the aim of expanding the horizons of one’s own framework of meaning and prejudice” (Held, 2001: 399). From my point of view, the meaningful aspect of this kind of approaches is that they locate *cosmopolitan citizenship* as a joint principle for the dialogue in a manifold political community and, consequently, an essential starting point for a *global governance*. In this sense, all these approaches are very important for the environmental problems as both their effects and political solutions share and belong to some elements of theoretical framework for *cosmopolitan approach*.

In any case, it is an old idea to tackle the new problems. In fact, *cosmopolitan citizenship* notion, together with similar ones such as *global citizenship*, are nothing but
new formulations of the former idea of world citizenship that appears and disappears, passing through great part of the history of political theory. As April Carter has pointed out, “the idea of world citizenship is fashionable again. It is a very old idea, which goes back in western thought to the Greek and Roman Stoics, was revived in the Renaissance and elaborated in the eighteenth-century Enlightenment. It also had some currency in the middle of the twentieth century and immediately after the Second World War. But the term world citizenship was not widely used -...-after the consolidation of the cold war in the early 1950s. In the 1990s world citizenship, quite often renamed global or cosmopolitan citizenship, surfaced again” (Carter, 2001: 1). On balance, it is the conceptual reformulation of an old idea to give an answer to the new challenges the citizenship theory is currently coping with.

The relevant issue in this point is that it has also affected green politics insofar as “green politics have also challenged traditional approaches to citizenship by stressing that environmental problems need internacional decisions” (Carter, 2001:5). This explains the laudability of the thesis which considers that the citizenship notions emerged from the green thought are other development of the concept of global citizenship. The reasons are the following: in the first place, the global and transnational character of the environmental degradation; in the second, the international strategy adopted by some environmental groups to carry out their goals; and finally, the citizenship theory of green political thought itself which can be expressed through the concepts of planetary citizenship or citizenship of planet earth (Steward, 1991) or ecological citizenship (Dobson, 2000b). In this sense, as well “green politics has encouraged a theoretical re-valuation of the concept of citizenship” and “both authors stress that green citizens have direct obligations beyond fellow human beings to other species and to the planet itself: Steward speaks of a duty of care and Dobson of the virtues of care and compassion” (Carter, 2001: 94). With no doubt, all this thought has its background in the creation of an “ethic of the nature care” which tries to search the different solutions to environmental problems beyond the Nation-state.

Other interesting aspect that lays the foundations of the concept of ecological citizenship is the emphasis in the relationship between collective responsibility and citizenship theory, highlighted by other analysis (Delanty, 1997; 2000). In an article where the efficiency of the postnational citizenship model within the European integration process is analyzed. He takes as a starting point the insufficiency of formal definitions of citizenships, exclusively based in a model of citizen rights, as “It is held
that there is more to citizenship than rights. Others dimensions include responsibilities or duties, participation in a broader sense, and identity. These dimensions – rights, duties or responsibilities, identity and participation – altogether express the different aspects of what membership of a political community entails” (Delanty, 1997: 286). This implies that “citizenship is a multilevelled concept involving four dimensions: rights, responsibilities, participation and identity” (Delanty, 1997:294) and therefore, his thesis is that postnational citizenship in the European integration context should, in relation to the previous definition, include several aspects: “human rights, including cultural rights (rights), environment (responsibilities), democracy, including subnational democracy (participation) and multiculturalism and reflexivity (identity)” (Delanty, 1997: 301).

However, the most essential aspect of this research relies in two aspects: on the one hand, what it really characterizes contemporary debates around citizenship is its criticism to the insufficiency of formal approaches and, on the other hand, that the contribution of ecologism to the idea of citizenship emphasises in the level of the obligations or responsibilities. The reason is that “environmentalists have argued for the inclusion of a notion of collective responsibility, raising the question whether nature has rights, and the concept of responsibility cannot be exhausted by reference to the notion of duties to the state, for it is held we have duties to nature as well as society” (Delanty, 1997: 286). The specific reason of this emphasis in this dimension of citizenship on the part of green politics transpires of its vision of nature as a subject of rights, what implies, simultaneously, that the next step is the search for a set of criteria to regulate the collective responsibility of human beings toward it and warrant their fulfilment beyond the obligations of the State. Thereby, the idea of collective responsibility goes beyond the State and as for the relation with the citizenship, it is becoming a core subject in political theory, which in this case, it is additionally justified for the global nature of the environmental problem itself and for the political action of ecologism but that by no means becomes exhausted with them. As Delanty remarks:” The duties and responsibilities of citizenship, it may also be argued that these are now extending to matters beyond the nation state and which cannot be reduced to the level of the state. For instance, we have duties to other social groups as well as to the environment...Bart Van Steenbergen argues that citizenship is once again becoming a revolutionary concept, this time as ecological citizenship which entails responsibility for nature...In other words, the idea of responsibility is being decoupled from the idea of duty and is becoming a key theme in the reinvention of politics today: social movements activists as
well as the wider public have a sense of being responsible for nature and towards the future...We may say that under the conditions of ideological fragmentation, the discourse of responsibility has been released from the conservative ideology and is being taken over by new social actors” (Delanty, 1997: 294-5).

This determines that one of the future essential axis of reflection of green political thought in that issue is to get a balance between the vindication of the environmental rights and the justification of the idea of collective responsibility. If it is so important to maintain that nature bears a set of rights, it is also equally important to think on the criteria of collective responsibility of human beings that serve to warrant rights on non human world and future generations. In this sense, the concept of ecological citizenship, that collects contributions and notions of the last decade, is basic for political ecologism as it can be the beginning of the political community joint to justify our responsibility toward nature.

Within citizenship theory, the idea of ecological citizenship is recently starting to be accepted as another improvement facing new social problems, although there is no unanimous consensus on the part of theorists, above all, because of their break with formal definitions of citizenship. Because of that, I consider ecological citizenship as a work in progress. In fact, we can describe an important thematic evolution in two stages: the first, in which this notion constitutes another contribution in the definition of a green democratic model within a critical reconstruction labour of the liberal tradition and, the second, in which there is an attempt of defining a proper conceptual space within a set of citizenship theories marked by a global age (Delanty, 2000) where the transnationality of environmental problems demand a theoretical framework of justification of both obligations and collective responsibility. By this means, the notion of ecological citizenship can be explained not only for the relation of ecologism with democracy but also for its relationship with political globalization or in other words, it is a notion which aims at defining its own space within both the green democratic model and a conceptual architecture of citizenship which gives an answer to the modern world.

ECOLOGICAL CITIZENSHIP AND THEORY OF GREEN DEMOCRACY

The interest for the concept of citizenship and the relationship with environment is relatively recent in green politics theory. As a matter of fact, we can distinguish within this discipline a first wave, from the end of 1980s until the beginning of 1990s,
oriented toward the political-ideological aspects of ecologism together with a second wave, which goes from mid 1990s till now, focused on the relationship of ecologism with the issues and concepts of political theory such as democracy, justice and citizenship (Dobson, 2000 a: ix). Situated, therefore, in this thematic shift within this second wave,”the debate on citizenship proposes, on the one hand, the problems of this liberal concept in relation to the ecological issues and, on the other, the elaboration of a citizenship theory compatible with the theoretical principles of ecologism”(the translation is mine) (Valencia, 2000: 183). In this way, and from an internal perspective of the evolution of political theory ecologism, it is a controversy that forms a part of an approach between the principles of liberalism and ecologism in which ”green political theory carries out a revision of the institutions and principles of liberal democracy which is at the same time critical and reconstructive and with it sets the basis of a green democracy that extends, in its own sense., the liberal” (the translation is mine) (Arias Maldonado, 1999: 187). A revision that, apart from the notion of citizenship, includes the liberal concepts of fundamental rights, political representation, autonomy, community and State.

In this line of argumentation, the reconstruction of the concept of liberal citizenship towards an ecological citizenship underlines “the responsibilities and obligations of the citizen in the framework of the sustainable society and in relation to the subrepresented collectives, as well as its socializator role of citizenships ecologically conscious. It is about, then, of an active citizenship which must go hand in hand with an extension of the political participation ”(the translation is mine) (Valencia, 2000: 191). In short, since mid 1990s, we have been talking of ecological citizenship as a notion whose goal is the contribution to the formulation of the ecologist project from a perspective that faces topics such as environmental constituencies, future generations and the transformation of the concept of participation and political representations in the framework of the construction of a different democratic model. Thereby, the reflection on the citizenship within the debate between ecologism and democracy is an essential element of support in the construction of a green democratic model.

The main problem to create a concept of citizenship by green politics theory was derived from the analysis of the dangers of the links between ecologism and democracy.

---

2 Obviously, this approach between liberalism and ecologism explains and locates but do not depletes other notions of citizenship that emerge within certain currents of thought of green political theory. About this topic, vid, Barry and Wissenburg (2001)
As I have pointed out before, “the main problem that provokes the contingency of the link between democracy and ecologism lies in two issues: in the first place, the tension that emerges from sustaining a concept of democracy according to a set of values that characterize the nature that are not always compatible; and, in the second place if green politics emphasizes results over procedures in accordance with the values nature is characterized, the defence of democracy is weak in the principles domain in spite of its bet for participative or radical ways of democracy. Notwithstanding, modern green politics refutes this second assertion in proportion to new attempts of fundamentation of a green democracy concept in which there is a serious discussion that not only affects its relationship with the principles of liberal democracy, but also to the problem of the rights of environmental protection and the notion of citizenship” (the translation is mine) (Valencia, 1998: 182-183). In this context, the paradox the construction of a green democratic model had to face was the postulation of a vision of participative and alternative democracy to the principles of liberal democracy that could assume the ecological principles and, at the same time, use as a reference framework the principles and institutions of liberal democracy. From this point of view, the concept of citizenship was seen as one of the deficits of liberal democracy in relation to ecological issues and this was expressed, essentially, in a criticism to the theoretical and institutional insufficiency of both participation and political representations.

This is the framework that favours a better understanding of formulations like Peter Christoff’s (1996) who postulates a concept of ecological citizenship as the answer of a subrepresentation of the citizenships in the field of environmental problems. The reasons of this fact are double: on the one hand, a conception of the political representation that restricts the political community to the field of the Nation-state and that, therefore, does not represent properly neither environmental interests nor non-citizenship interests; and, on the other because both the representation and political participation of ecological interests depend on the political persuassion political parties may exert within the electoral competition. Therefore, the incidence of the ecological interests and our responsibility toward nature determine a dislocation of our ideas of citizenship, participation and political representations. The idea is revise both concepts as well as make possible institutional reforms. The citizenship plays a key role in this extention of the political community and ecological comfort. This way, “ecological citizenship is centrally defined by its attempt to extend social welfare discourse to recognise “universal” principles relating to environmental rights and centrally...
incorporate these in law, culture and politics. In part, it seeks to do so by pressing for recognition or the need actively to include human “non-citizens” (in a territorial and legal sense) in decision making. It also promotes fundamental incorporation of the interests of other species and future generation into processes of democratic consideration. This leads to challenges to extend the boundaries of existing political citizenship beyond the formerly relatively homogeneous notions of the “nation-state” and “national community” that to date have determined “formal” citizenship (Christoff, 1996: 161-162).

In fact, ecological citizenship is linked to the idea of ecological welfare. This means an extention of the political and social citizenship, new social demands that require a deep change of the work distribution and capitalist productive system. Nevertheless, there is certain ambiguity in this point. It is not clear whether this concept implies a reorientation, a break or even is possible within the own capitalist system. These three positions compete in the ecologist movement and for that, “this ambiguity perhaps relates more to the different tactics of green and wider environmental movements and their different political and economic analyses rather than the normative construction of ecological citizenship as such” (Christoff, 1996: 162). Consequently, ecological citizenship is really important as an inclusion and implication institution and “is called to strength green summons to a bigger political participation, responsible, and ecologically sensitive, in the framework of a community that admits the differences and copes with all their moral and political responsibilities with the subrepresented collectives” (the translation is mine) (Arias Maldonado and Valencia Saiz, 1998:216)

In this line we can locate John Barry´ s approach. For him citizenship is a core element within green democratic model. Nevertheless, whereas according to Christoff (1996), ecological citizenship is more an institution of inclusion that strenghts the change of paticipation and political representations and their formulae in the institutional field, for Barry (1996; 1999) is more an institution of implication within a normative vision of democracy that must go beyond the institutional reforms of our democratic systems that,all the same, have experiences of real application (LETS) (the translation is mine) (Barry and Proops, 2000).

In this sense, citizenship for Barry is closely related with a deliberative democratic model, that is to say, “as a form of social learning turns on the view of democracy as a communicative process. It is also related to such practices as LETS...，“ which can be regarded as forms of social learning and adaptation to changed ecological
conditions and socio-economic conditions, as well as the ecological restructuring of the state and economy” (Barry, 1999: 229). This relationship is extremely important as entails that the internalization of the others interests –non human, future generations and aliens- and the shift of preferences as a result of the democratic deliberation. Thus, citizenship understood this way is basic to sustain the idea of an ecological rationality, as “democratic citizenship in short permits the possibility of the voluntary creation and maintenance of an ecologically rational society-nature interaction, informed by moral as well as scientific considerations. This is because communicative as well as instrumental rationality characterizes ecological rationality” (Barry, 1999:230).

Furthermore, it presents another additional advantage, as this idea of active citizenship is associated to a deliberative democratic model and compatible with the representative democratic system. This involves that the theory and practice of green democracy do not demand a direct democracy because it is accepted the argument that the problems of democracy (including ecological ones among them) are not solved with democracy. This way, citizenship is a “civic virtue” as it is based in the individual responsibility that citizens have in the achievement of sustainability. From this perspective (Barry, 1999:231), the citizenship within green political theory highlights the citizen obligations, contributing individually a little to the collective aim of the achievement of a sustainable society. When we talk of a “civic virtue” in this context it refers to consider other interests and an opening for the debate and deliberation. On the other hand the citizen obligations go beyond the political system and are closer to an individual action –something expressed in recycling or save energy activities- which leads to the need to foster a sustainability culture, a bioculture or an ecological emergent culture of contemporary democratical societies, basis of green or ecological causes and attitudes.

To conclude, his conception of green citizenship is a civic virtue which must be introduced not only in the conscience but also in the political culture of the citizens within the framework of a deliberative democracy so as to get sustainability. It is this theoretical approach that determines his concern in the so called LETS (Local Exchange Trading Systems), an exchange system of goods and informal services originated in Canada in 1983 and that it has generated a set of different sociological and ideological interpretations since then. His concern for this topic took them (Barry and Proops, 2000) to analyze the attitudes of the LETS members in the UK. As for the relationship between citizenship and environment the analysis presents two relevant conclusions: on
the one hand, a dislike toward the democratic system and, on the other, a concept of active citizenship which contributes to the community responsibility. This way, LETS constitutes an empirical reference framework of Barry’s citizenship ideas.

In synthesis, formulations as the aforementioned fall upon a vision of ecological citizenship as an inclusion and implication mechanism. In the first case, underlies a theoretical effort which tries to create the institutional mechanisms of political participation and representation on ecological interests. In the second case, the goal is similar but the objective is not so much the institutional reform as to situate the citizenship in the nucleus of a deliberative democracy as the key for the sustainability achievement.

ECOLOGICAL CITIZENSHIP: A NEW WAY OF CITIZENSHIP IN THE THEORY OF CONTEMPORARY CITIZENSHIP.

In any case, a recent turn in the reflection to this topic is observed. If up to now, as we have already seen, that this notion was another element of the conceptual span of the green democratic model, today the question is to determine if ecologism has a proper notion and, if so, what is so different from traditional and other contemporary approaches, above mentioned. In this context, the ecological citizenship would be a new way of citizenship that arises as a result of an interaction between the classical dimensions of citizenship and other new ones. In my opinion, the debate from the end of 1990s was defined by several features: in the first place, the one of that authors who rejected the possibility of sustaining a notion of ecological citizenship (Isin and Wood, 1999); in the second place, and as Dobson has remarked (Dobson, 2000 b: 41-42) the one of a set of frustrated fundaments (Van Steenbergen, 1994b; Twine, 1994), above all, for the dependence in approach of Marshall’s work and his emphasis in the rights problem; in the third place, some isolated case outside this problem and suggests but scarcely develops an original idea –“new politics of obligation”- as the ground of ecological citizenship (Smith, 1998); finally, those authors who try to give their own epistemological status to this concept (Dobson, 2000 b, 2003; Jelin, 2000). The idea of these is, therefore, define their own space within contemporary theory of citizenship.

In any case, from my point of view, the most severe approach then was Dobson’s (2000 b). I have dealt this contribution in some of my works (Valencia 2002), so I will try to sum up briefly his position. Dobson’s thesis is that green politics takes
part of the traditional architecture of the citizenship but constitutes an independent notion due to its break, in a wide variety of aspects, with it.

The first aspect of this break is the traditional axis between rights and obligations. As we have already mention before, the characteristic of citizenship formal definitions was to emphasise the possession of rights. Nevertheless, a concern for the obligations and responsibilities of the citizens is observed in recent political theory. Ecological citizenship goes around obligations –for example, before future generations and toward other species- but with no reciprocity guarantee in return. This leads to a difficulty to joint ecological citizenship within democratic societies and for their acknowledgement, as it breaks with the contractual vision of citizenship and reciprocity of rights in contrast to obligations toward community. The clearest objection could be the lack of a political entity to sustain it. However, it is obvious, that in order for the citizenship to think in contemporary terms the Nation-state does not define, at least, fully the relationship with citizens. In this sense, we have to point out a set of new justification criteria that affect political and moral thought. In this case, it is an ethic of care and compasion.

The second aspect of this break is the division between the public and the private. It is clear that the field of the private is a core place of the citizenship activity and where the virtues of ecological citizenship are learnt. This implies that for ecologism, and feminism as well, the personal is political as far as many private acts have political consequences and, thereby, the private sphere of home is an essential space for the activity of the ecological citizenship. Here the problem is that if the break with this distinction nullifies the possibility of this concept. Dobson prefers to adopt a more tinged position, the question is not to abolish the distinction between the public and the private but to reform it –together with our citizenship conceptions-exposed to ecological concerns.

The third aspect of this break is the opposition between activity and passivity, between active citizenship and passive citizenship. The problem lies in that both categories have an acute political character. Thus, the activity is associated with the public sphere –and has positive and progressist connotations- whereas passivity is linked to the private –and has negative and conservative connotations-. In this sense, the activity is understood as social obligations in the public sphere as opposed to the passivity in which rights in the private sphere are claimed. Here the break takes place because the ecological citizenship distorts this distinction as it can be actively be
exerted in the private sphere. In this way, the activism of the ecological citizen can be correctly exerted in both fields.

A fourth aspect of this break has to do with the ownership problem and, as a result, of the criteria that define who are the members or citizens of full right. In traditional approaches there is a close relationship between both aspects, between being member and owner of citizenship. Nonetheless, ecological citizenship differs in two aspects: in the first place, the emphasis that ecological citizenship give to the duties breaks so much with the topic of the ownership because, in principle they do not address to anybody in concrete, as a result, we have to establish more flexible criteria to be a member; and, in the second place, the ecological citizenship breaks with the vertical (and reciprocal) relationship between the citizen and the State and establishes a horizontal relationship among citizens. Both are important aspects because they change the ownership conditions (members), of inclusion (aliens), obligations (toward other species and future generations) within a conception of the citizenship which breaks with the territorial framework of the Nation-state.

However, the notion of ecological citizenship also differs in two essential dimension of the citizenship theory: on the one hand, for its relationship with the virtues underlying in classical conceptions; and, on the other, for the political conditions that must promote its development. In the first case, the crucial is not the defence of values as a political participation or procedimentalism of liberal democracy, but an ethic of the care or compassion, as, because of its own nature it heads for the other generalized, remote and unknown. The duties of the ecological citizenship turn toward remote unknown and, of course, they are not opposed to the notion of general welfare of any kind of citizenship. In the second case, the joint of ecological citizenship also presents two own peculiarities. Primarily, there is a connection between the global and the local that determines that its exercise can be done anywhere although they are learnt in the private environment. Secondly, that its root goes beyond the limits of the Nation-state and, consequently, its scope of activity is the world or the earth, what connects it with the answers to the globalization of the cosmopolitan approach.

To sum up, if the ecological citizenship breaks with the traditional notions of citizenship because it affects the obligations, is addressed to unknown, implies virtues of care and compassion which are exerted in the public and private field in a context beyond the Nation-state. Is ecological citizenship a post-cosmopolitan citizenship? Dobson seems to think so in his last book (Dobson, 2003). For reasons of time and
space, at the moment I can not deal with the implications of his recent and more elaborated approach.

Notwithstanding, before the concept of ecological citizenship, planned before the book, a few criticisms can be made. I have insisted here in this model of ecological citizenship that emphasizes obligations more than rights, what it is justified with an “ethic of the care or compasion.” I think that we need a more elaborated job around the criteria of moral justification of obligations. In this sense, it is necessary a more solid development of an “ethic of compassion”. Normally, compassion has been understood as "the moral intuition which sprouts from the own vulnerability of the human being" (the translation is mine)(Arteta, 1996:258). Compassion could be understood, in this context, as a moral intuition that sprouts from the vulnerability of nature by the irresponsible human action and of which human vulnerability itself is derived. In this point, compassion does not emerge solely by the intrinsic damage we provoke in nature but also for the consequences our irresponsible action has for the own human vulnerability, other natural species and future generations. On the other hand, we think that ecological citizenship requires simultaneously an important labour in the field of the rights, although we recognize that obligations are structurally its natural scope. Finally, the problem is how we joint politically a citizenship that has as a priviledge stage the private sphere, based in the learning and obligations practice, promoted at the same time for the virtue of care and compassion, not only from the individual scope until the statal but until the international and intergenerational spheres. Two aspects arise here: on the one hand, it would be neccessary an important labour from the public educational scope of the ecological citizenship and, on the other, a perception of the “ecological citizens” of environmental rights to justify their rights as well.

This way, if we retake the former question, Is it possible a notion of citizenship in political ecologism? The answer is yes. Nonetheless, as we have already seen, green political theory has answered the question in two directions: on the one hand, when citizenship is joint as a key idea of the green democratical project; and, on the other, when it is joint to the citizenship theory itself. In both cases, it is a notion that breaks with both the architecture of the citizenship theory within a process of development in which the shift of the relationship between the global and the local and the internationalization of contemporary politics are essential.

Finally, there is a last reasoning in favour of this idea and it is that I do believe that the ecological citizenship perfectly connects with the citizenship conceptions of
contemporary political theory. In this sense, this concept takes refuge perfectly to the aspects proposed by Clarke (1999) within his ideas of deep citizenship in which he proposes an exercise of civic virtues not only in the field of the public sphere and in which and it is possible the coexistence of different citizenship options as a consequence of the dislocation of the traditional places where politics was exerted. In this sense, ecological citizenship is an expression and another answer toward a political world in which relationships between the individual and the political community are changing and in which citizenship is an open theoretical space that needs new answers. If, as I have stated above, the environmental challenge constitutes one of the main problems of the global governance, it opens the possibility of the construction of a global civil society, as a consequence of the need for a global answer for environmental problems, but it also needs a more determined collaboration of the States. This paradox determines a disjunction between the urgent need of political solutions structural and global and some frustrating results due to the lack of political volition. It is true that many consider the environmental dimension of politics as one of the axis that prove that globalization is ungovernable or strengthens the contradictions of the current order and, consequently, the efforts of the cosmopolitan approach in this direction are useless. Nevertheless, I think that the ecological citizenship as a new way of citizenship together with other possible ones, can create a space of reflection, a normative answer that, in this concrete case, induce the debate and neccessary political solutions that environmental challenge requires in the globalization age.
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